

**Subarea Steering Committee  
St. Mary's Center  
107 Spencer Rd, Toledo, WA**

**February 17, 2010  
Meeting Notes**

**Attendees:** Barbara Kincaid, Mark Cook, Larry Mason, Roger Wagoner, Sheryl Bertucci, Cy Meyers, Glen Cook, Dave Holland, Michelle Whitten, Jerry Pratt, Andy Lane, Jess Winters, Skip Urling, Bill Jones, Rodney Murschel, Dick Larman, Pat Anderson

Larry Mason stated for the record that the airport name is the Ed Carlson Memorial Field.

**1. Welcome and Introductions**

Barb called the meeting to order at 3:03 pm. Introductions were made.

**2. Overview and Update**

The purpose of the meeting was to reconvene since the completion of Phase I of the sub area plan. The document needs to be reviewed and commented on so it can go to the Planning Commission for adoption. Barb would like to move ahead for Phase II and give an overview of what has happened since last June. We need to refresh ourselves about committee members, the steering committee and the decision-making process.

We are partnered with WDFW and DOE and Department of Commerce (formerly CTED). We have looked at a 20-year planning horizon to come up with planning strategies and we have begun the framework, which you will take home with you to study.

We went after grant money for an economist because the function of this sub area plan is to promote economic development. A regional market analysis was completed and copies are available. We started transportation work and that committee overlaps some with the steering committee. The group developed a conceptual use map. It agreed that the aggressive plan for development was the best alternative. We took that map to the transportation folks for analysis. A weak link in Phase I was the capital facilities and utilities because this scheme cannot be adopted unless we know how to get water and service to those users. Barb has been working with the Tribe, BOCC and city mayors in this regard. The regional sewer strategy is another item we worked on. That document is also available.

Gibbs and Olson did a large overview of looking at a regional facility, looking at cost estimates for construction and operations and maintenance and rates that the cities could compare to building or upgrading their own systems. Whether it will be more efficient and affordable to look at a regional option is now in the hands of our BOCC.

We also spent time on another grant from DOE in working on the water issue. Some are familiar with the WIRA and future allocation potential from the Cowlitz. We have been attending monthly meetings and BHC is working on a water study. We need to determine what the best management is for the water resources that are out there. We are taking population projections and adding them to future development proposals for 20 years to see if there will be enough water. We do not have that final study yet. If there is a need for more water, we need to work with the planning unit for the WIRA to

permit withdrawing more water. At this point the mayors and BOCC and Tribe have been moving ahead to look at the regional water which makes more sense.

The transportation issue is going through the policy makers.

Cy asked how much water we are asking for. Barb stated there are two tables and this is going to rule writing now. DOE took the watershed plans for three counties that use the Cowlitz water and developed a planning document re: setting stream flows that would only allow withdrawal to a certain amount. Those levels determine how much water is available without hurting the fish. The planning document has a table for cfs (cubic feet per second) reserved. It is a water right that must be applied for and it names the cities of Toledo and Winlock. Lewis County does not have a dedicated water right for this. There is 3.2 cfs for Winlock and reserved for future use is 6.6 cfs. Andy stated that is not allocated yet.

Roger stated so far this rule is only for in-stream flows, not for private wells or ground water.

Barb stated we need to know how much water is set for reserved allocation before they set the stream flow and we need water to support our South County scheme.

The work will be on-going for transportation capacities, policy decisions about managing water resources or sewer resources in South County. Those policy directions when made will come back to this group as those elements are refined in our planning document.

Bill Jones asked if we have adequate water allocated for the aggressive plan we have selected. Barb stated we don't know yet. The numbers are being worked on by John at BHC from all the cities. Some policies will have an effect on the bottom line.

Roger stated there is a "reservation" which is not an allocation. It says it can be used for public benefit. To allocate it to users it must go through a process to secure the water. We are confident that with the reservation there appears to be enough water for the cities and their expected growth and what we have been using for the non-municipal growth area (5.5m square feet for commercial, industrial, recreational and tourism, which is a crystal ball look). Once we are comfortable with it we wait and see if the market will come and take advantage. If everyone is on board, we think DOE will be okay.

DOE feels comfortable with the work we are doing and three of their four-part test have been met. We are justifying through our work the beneficial use part of that application. You cannot put a plan out there and adopt land use and expect it to be defensible if you don't have water and sewer and a budget to do that. That element is quite weak and that is what we need to work on to make stronger if it should be appealed.

### **3. Committee Membership and Decision Making Process**

Barb stated we need an aggressive agenda and we need to understand our roles. This is an advisory body and as such we need to make decisions that we can recommend to the Planning Commission and to the BOCC who would adopt what we present. We created nine slots for membership when we set up the committee and we filled all but two of those. The members are: Sheryl and Larry with the Tribe; Barb and Phil with Lewis County; Jerry and Michelle from Toledo; Larry Mason is with the airport; Ken

and David from Vader; the Mayor and Tammy from Winlock. Barb asked Glen if he wanted to name a different alternate.

Glen stated Tammy could stay in that position and he has a couple of other people in mind.

Barb stated there are still two at-large positions. The group engaged in extensive discussion about filling those two and decided to wait. She stated the committee makes decisions by consensus and it has been loose about "thumb up/thumb down". Barb asked if everyone agrees to keep thumbs up. There was consensus to keep that.

Barb suggested filling the two at large positions with Cy representing the South County Chamber and Bill Jones representing the PFD. She asked for discussion on these positions.

Glen stated Cy was removed from office because he did not include public participation and Mary Garrison does not have a willingness to include public input. They do not have a good reputation for involving the public that they represent. He is reluctant to go with this type of representation and would rather see another person.

Jerry disagreed. He stated the South County Chamber does belong on this committee. Cy has a lot of wisdom and he would like to see Cy on the committee.

David stated the committee needs individuals with whom the committee has already worked. We need to keep a track with people who have been working with Barb and the BOCC for the goals we have in mind.

Dick stated the South Lewis County Chamber is important to him because he represents the big commercial and industrial players; the Chamber folks are working on recreational and tourism aspects that are important.

Rod stated Cy was instrumental in getting the UGA developed. He has been on board all along.

Barb asked about the PFD. We talked about whether or not this position should be filled by a property owner or a business owner and who could represent the broadest specialty.

Cy stated the PFD is an important player in South County and Bill has the background and has attended the meetings.

Jerry stated his opinion is the same as for Cy. Bill has been here since day one and we need to keep the people who have been involved. He is in favor of Bill.

Barb stated we have sub-committee members and break out groups and there are a lot of people who have participated and who will continue to participate.

Jerry stated Jess Winters has been very involved, also.

Michelle asked what the goal is of the steering committee compared to the sub-committee and its involvement. She asked if we need to replace someone from one sub-committee.

Barb stated this consensus model is informal and the only time the steering committee comes into play is if the broader group cannot come to a consensus. Mayor Pratt stated if we all agree we do not need to take a vote. With the accelerated pace this year there may be times when we need to call meetings of just the nine people to get the work done.

Glen stated it is hard to get nine people together for a consensus. Dick stated we have done e-mail votes, too. Barb stated telephone meetings make sense.

Barb asked the group if the way we set this up make sense and is it still relevant to doing Phase II. Dick stated given the size of the sub area nine people is not too many.

Jerry stated the group did not finish commenting about a private land owner on the committee. Jess said he did not need to be on the committee but he would like to know when the meetings are being held. Roger suggested we do not need to put names on these positions, just the entities.

There was a thumb up from most to keep the PFD and the Chamber.

Barb reminded everyone that they are ambassadors to tell people about these meetings and to answer questions about what is going on.

Bill stated the more of us who know what is going on and can update the public the more the recommendation will be understood. The BOCC has been good with sharing information with us. Barb stated it would be helpful when she sends out a meeting notice to let other people know, such as chamber members and other groups. These are open meetings and anyone can come to find out what we are doing.

Barb wanted to stress that the GMA is not requiring us to do the sub area plan and Lewis County is not requiring this plan. There are rumors that there is no money, we have not had any meetings and the sub area is dead. These are myths to allay. Barb stated we have another grant to keep Roger working on the plan and the BOCC is working with the legislature on a bill for a budget proviso to go into the governor's budget for the planning and design work. We do have some money and we will keep working.

Bill stated we need a lobbyist to get additional money for water and sewer. The public meeting was a very good, positive meeting. The people who have been paying attention to us are in favor of what we are doing. Right now we are in control, not the developers.

#### **4. Phase II: Path to Adoption**

Barb stated we are ready to go to the next level and asked Roger to discuss the plan.

Roger stated everyone's reading assignment is the Phase II draft. It would be helpful to bring comments to the meeting next month. He referred to pages 5 and 6. Page 5 has major findings from the process last year, which includes the survey, the open house, etc. Key recommendations are next and those are more specific to the actions that we believe we heard and understood to be the combined effort that the plan should specifically talk about. There are terms that may or may not stay alive. The rest is the

analysis of what we went through; transportation has to be updated and water and sewer work will need to be added into it.

The schedule is driven by direction of the BOCC to adopt a sub area plan. Working back from that date and the time for public hearings with the Planning Commission provided the information that is illustrated here. In addition to the South County part of this, there are things that need attention. There are the countywide population allocations which is part of the GMA process. It is currently out of date and that needs to be updated to identify the 20 year forecast for the three cities and other areas we want to include in South County. That group (the Planned Growth Committee) adopts policies to adopt and expand UGAs. Those policies do not talk about what we are doing and that work needs to be done to ensure internal consistencies. The Comp Plan, adopted in 2004, is also out of date, and has been amended since then but a lot of the information is much older than 2004. It does not look at the potential for what we are trying to do in South Lewis County, which is increasing economic development. The County will re-adopt the comprehensive plan in December.

Roger stated the comp plan includes the EIS written in 2002 and it is old, also. We want to do a focused EIS on growth in South Lewis County. It is his opinion that the number crunching information is not very detailed. The EIS has to be a 10,000 foot view. To get it done in time, we must initiate scoping and invite the public to tell us what should go in.

It was stated that we have 3.5 months for that which raised the question if that is sufficient time. Roger stated as we write urban development standards it will fold into the sub area plan and the EIS will be part of that plan. Scoping will cover that information.

The bottom line is the PGC (Planned Growth Committee), this group and the city councils will need to be briefed. This group will meet every month and we will brief the Planning Commission and the city councils. There needs to be a lot of cooperation with all the people involved.

Roger explained the slides in the handout. Next month he would like to know if there are there gaps, flaws, inaccuracies or unclear parts of the Phase II draft report. More information will be available at that time. At the last meeting we had the REQ and Philipsville on the table. Some people still think we need those types of uses and we need to express those kinds of uses as a regional demand picture and work towards how those could be accommodated in the county. We also need to keep track of the map where we stopped last year. Green indicates tourist; red is retail; gray represents industrial. Yellow is what we have added and that is the newly designated growth board approved ARL. There are some areas where ARL overlaps some of the land uses (industrial, etc) and we need to figure out what we can do there.

Roger informed the group that the County adopted a procedure for property owners to request their designation be changed to something else. The property owner must do that with certain criteria. He asked if in South Lewis County we could do that as part of amending the county plan.

Andy stated when it gets to the state of land use, and there is ARL designation, it will go back through the County and the County will look at the criteria that put it in. Bill asked if we have to recommend alternate land. Andy stated no, it is not an exchange. It is evaluating the land and how it meets the criteria.

Roger stated this is a 20 year plan and hopefully there will be a lot of flexibility because we don't know what the demand will be for these uses. Barb stated we had an MPR for Philipsville at Exit 63 and this fit with the regional market analysis for having tourism and now we don't have it. Roger stated there is nothing in the zoning code to allow MPR and other potential uses. All white areas on the map are rural.

Roger stated the community came around to understand the process and we need to keep the momentum going.

Michelle stated Toledo wants to increase its UGA. Will that still occur? Roger stated the UGA is a decision that is made by the BOCC. There are people who will argue that we have enough UGA. To the extent we talk about expanding UGAs in South Lewis County there needs to be adequate justification that we do need more UGA. There is not much in the way of substantiating hospitality uses so we must come up with the rationale for that.

Michelle stated in looking at justification for Toledo to increase its UGA and looking at Winlock's and Vader's UGAs why would the County say we need an increase? Roger stated we are not doing it for population and residential land. It is all about economic development. He pointed out the industrial area north of Toledo on the map. We need to talk early about if this is in the right place or includes enough land area, etc. It is important to read your homework.

Andy stated most of the focus has been on commercial development. Toledo can show residential need and that is one way to justify a UGA expansion. The other need is economic need. If there is a residential need it must be considered but we are focused on the commercial side.

Dick cautioned not to lose site of the residential side. If a large corporation comes in, the people have to live somewhere.

Roger stated Hovee did a specific report in identifying leakage in retail services. The report states that South Lewis County could support 75,000 square feet of retail. The problem is national companies who want to bring retail to the area do not see the population that will support them. Identifying centers where that type of retail can come is very important. You do not want your downtowns to suffer. Where the Chamber comes in is to provide information about demand and potential leads, etc, for other types of retail services that should be coming to South Lewis County.

Barb stated regarding the residential demand we are promoting economic development and creating jobs but there is a housing element in the plan. Each piece must be looked at and they must be consistent with the entire package.

There have been good comments about the size of urban land we already have designated in Lewis County. Dick stated 1% is what we have. Flood maps are another issue and there will be a lot of arguing about where the boundaries are and fortunately South Lewis County does not flood.

Sheryl asked for confirmation about whether or not the committee will include Cy. She would be disappointed if Cy was not included. Roger stated we are keeping the Chamber as a member.

### **5. Set Next Meeting**

The next meeting will be on Wednesday, March 10 at 3:00 at St. Mary's Center. The members thought it best to schedule several meetings in advance. They will be held on the 2<sup>nd</sup> Wednesday of every month and will be hosted by St. Mary's center. Those dates will be April 14 and May 12. In May CITH may not be available but the meeting can be held at St. Mary's.

Dick noted we should be done in July except for briefing the BOCC and Planning Commission. Roger stated that is when we get into public comments and we have not discussed how we will do that. We will go to the Planning Commission and this group must be represented at those meetings.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30.